

but having no gun I was unable to obtain a specimen for close inspection. On the 15th of January while calling on a taxidermist friend, I saw what was without a doubt a Loggerhead Shrike, that had been taken near here, yet he did not know it to be anything uncommon, as he is very poorly informed in ornithology. This is probably a new addition to the birds of New Brunswick, and for which a keen lookout will be kept in future — WM. H. MOORE, *Scotch Lake, York Co., N. B.*

**The Scientific Name of the Southern Yellow-throat.** — Mr. Chapman's disagreement (*Auk*, Oct., 1900, p. 389) with my acceptance of *Geothlypis trichas roscoe* (Aud.), brings up an interesting nomenclatural question well worth discussing. I have never seen *trichas* in a cypress tree, but I have seen *roscoe* often. This is not of course evidence that Audubon shot a *roscoe* but neither is Mr. Chapman's idea that the bird was a *trichas* because it was high up in a cypress and the time September. It should be remembered that Audubon knew little about subspecies and nothing about their values, and therefore his action in reversing a former view is not surprising. Also, previous to the publication of Dr. Hasbrouck's paper, and Mr. Brewster's name for the western bird, all were considered as *trichas*. My conclusion on the subject was based on ideas not thought necessary to discuss in a long paper but I will do so now that the issue has been raised.

Hasbrouck definitely and rightly separated the southern bird and would have given a new name but for the existence of the name *Sylvia roscoe*. It seemed reasonable from the evidence before him that Audubon's bird under the circumstances was the southern form. Chapman brought forward no additional evidence concerning the distribution of these birds and has not disproved the early view of Audubon, or Hasbrouck's action. The known eastern distribution of these birds for hundreds of miles beyond the limits set for it by Chapman, and the existence of Gulf specimens referable to the same form, renders Hasbrouck's acceptance of Audubon's name logical and reasonable. It should be, scientifically speaking, necessary that positive evidence should be acquired before upsetting a name so well established as Hasbrouck's, yet Mr. Chapman furnished none in his paper and none since.

There is no taint on Hasbrouck's name; it is not a homonym, nor is there a particle of evidence to prove or even tending to show, that it is a synonym of *G. trichas trichas*. It is really necessary to dispose logically of the older name by *evidence*, not opinion. I consider that there are three things which should prevent acceptance of Mr. Chapman's name, and that the burden of proof rests with Mr. Chapman, not with the other side. It is necessary to prove that *Sylvia roscoe* is a synonym of *G. trichas trichas*. It is necessary to prove that the southern bird does not exist in the cypress swamps of Mississippi. It is necessary to show that another form occurs in that State that in all probability is Audubon's bird. Until

the certainty of either of these premises is shown, priority and fairness demands that *G. t. roscoe* should stand. I think now, as I thought long ago, that the publication of *G. t. igtota* was unnecessary and should be ignored until proof, not opinion, is produced to set aside the older name.  
—WILLIAM PALMER, *Washington, D. C.*

**The Correct Name for the Florida Yellow-throat.**—Accepting Mr. Palmer's line of argument, in the preceding note, as the logical one by which to determine the proper name of the Florida Yellow-throat, I would ask him on what ground he ignores Audubon's statement that the bird he described as *Sylvia roscoe* was a young Maryland Yellow-throat? Audubon was more discriminating than Mr. Palmer evidently believes him to have been and until his identification of *Sylvia roscoe* has been *proved* to be erroneous we are not justified in rejecting his views.

It may be added, that all the facts in the case strongly suggest that Audubon's type was a migrant. Hence, even if it be later discovered that the breeding Yellow-throats of western Mississippi are identical with the resident Florida form, it by no means follows that Audubon's name *roscoe* is applicable to them. In short, we shall be warranted in reversing Audubon's decision only after an examination of his type, and as this probably does not exist, there will doubtless never be a reason for refusing to accept his conclusions.—FRANK M. CHAPMAN, *American Museum of Natural History, New York City.*

**Probable Breeding of the Red-bellied Nuthatch near Boston.**—I am requested by Mr. F. H. Mosher to report that he saw in June, 1899, in Medford, Mass., a Red-bellied Nuthatch (*Sitta canadensis*) busily engaged in catching and carrying away larvæ, presumably to its young. Mr. Mosher failed, however, to locate the supposed nest, for the Nuthatch, as he was tracing it through the woods, was set upon by a Wood Pewee and driven out of sight.

On other occasions during the summer of 1899, this species was observed in this locality by Mr. Mosher.—J. A. FARLEY, *Malden, Mass.*

**The Newfoundland Veery (*Hylocichla fuscescens fuliginosa*) in Massachusetts.**—On the 27th of last September I shot a specimen of this lately described bird in Lanesboro, Berkshire Co., Mass.,—the first example taken in this State. The four autumnal records for New England fall within the narrow limits of five days (Sept. 23–27), and indicate a migration through this region considerably later than the departure of the native Veeries for the South. In 1889 I killed a Veery in Waltham, Mass., on the extraordinarily late date, Oct. 5. This bird was unfortunately not preserved, but without much doubt it belonged to the race *fuliginosa*.—WALTER FAXON, *Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass.*